



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,917	11/16/2001	Joel Brian Derrico	9512-002-27	7900
7590	11/08/2004		EXAMINER	
Supervisor, Patent Prosecution Services PIPER MARBURY RUDINICK & WOLFE LLP 1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036-2412			RAY, GOPAL C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2111	

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/987,917	DERRICO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gopal C. Ray	2111	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 37-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

1. Claims 1-39 are presented for examination.
2. The drawings filed on 10/21/2004 are acceptable by the examiner. However, the drawings have not yet been reviewed by the USPTO draftsperson. Direct any inquiries concerning drawing review by the USPTO draftsperson to the Drawing Review Branch at (703) 305-8404.
3. Claims 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The examiner notes the following ambiguities. However, all claims should be revised carefully to eliminate all grammatical errors and antecedent basis problems.

As per claim 37, the claim is vague and indefinite. The preamble recites "a method of distributing power utilizing a DC-DC converter ...". However, it is unclear from the body of the claim as to how the DC-DC convert is utilized to distribute the power. This is a mere statement of intended result because there is no utilization of DC-DC converter in the body of the claim.

- As per claims 38-39, the claims incorporate the deficiencies of parent claim 37.
4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,033,112 issued to Bowling et al.

As per claim 37, the reference of Bowling et al. teaches "accepting DC power directly from a single input source" in Fig. 1, element 12 and col. 3, line 68 – col. 4, line

2; “distributing voltage from the single input source to desired operational voltages of the computer network appliance” in col. 4, lines 27-34.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,033,112 issued to Bowling et al. in view of US Patent 5,161,097 issued to Ikeda.

As per claims 38-39, the reference of Bowling et al. fails to expressly teach “wherein the MTBF of the computer network appliance increases due to the use of the DC-DC converters in the power module” (claim 38) and “wherein the computer network appliance uses less power and generates less heat due to the use of the DC-DC converters in the power module” (claim 39). However, the above features were well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by Ikeda. The reference of Ikeda teaches “wherein the MTBF of the computer network appliance increases due to the use of the DC-DC converters in the power module” in col. 1, lines 19-23 and “wherein the computer network appliance uses less power and generates less heat due to the use of the DC-DC converters in the power module” in col. 3, lines 16-21. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to describe the above features in the system of

Bowling et al. because of the following reasons. It is well within the skill of an ordinary person in the art at the time of the invention to realize that the MTBF of the computer network appliance increases due to the use of the DC-DC converters in the power module because of conversion and stabilization processes. However, it pays off because the computer network appliance uses less power and hence generates less heat due to the use of the DC-DC converters in the power module.

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/21/2004 with respect to claims 1-36 have been fully considered and they are persuasive. Claims 1-36 are allowable because the prior art of record, alone or in combination, does not teach or fairly anticipate all the limitations of the claims as pointed out by applicant in "Remarks" filed on 10/21/2004.

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 37-39 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gopal C. Ray whose telephone number is (571) 272-3631. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart, can be reached on (571) 272-3632. The new fax phone number for this Group is (571) 272-3632.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [mark.rinehart@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to TC central telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Lastly, paper copies of cited U.S. Patents and Patent Application Publications ceased to be mailed to applicants with office actions as of June 2004. Paper copies of Foreign Patents and Non-Patent Literature will continue to be included with office actions. These cited U.S. Patents and Patent Application Publications are available for download via Office's PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. Patents and Patent Application Publications are available on the USPTO web site (www.uspto.gov), from the office of Public Records and from commercial sources. Applicants are referred to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at <http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html> or 1-866-217-9197 for information on this policy. Requests to restart a period for response due to a missing U.S. Patent or Patent Application Publications will not be granted.

Gopal C. Ray
GOPAL C. RAY
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2800